

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-identified application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-18 are currently pending. Claims 19-23 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 24 is new.

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Brown et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,278,448) (hereinafter "Brown") in view of Barlow et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,275,935) (hereinafter "Barlow") and further in view of Humes (U.S. Patent Number 6,539,430). Prior to discussing this ground of rejection in detail, a brief summary of a method for preventing inadvertent data entry into a web page according to exemplary embodiments of the present invention is provided below to highlight some of the advantageous characteristics thereof.

According to exemplary embodiments of the present invention, output data may include Cascading Style Sheets as part of a web page, which also includes source code that may be executed by a browser. A "membrane" style may be defined in the output data at a z-index higher than the other layers of the web page. In addition, the membrane is initially hidden and can be positioned and sized such that it covers the entire web page to be displayed by the browser. When the user clicks a submit button, or the like, to initiate a transaction with the vendor application software via the web page, a submitIt function is called. The submitIt function sends the data as input data to the web server and calls a showMembrane function. The showMembrane function changes the membrane style to visible, and the lower layers of a page then become inaccessible due to the higher z-index and visibility attribute of the web page division (layer) associated with the "membrane" style. This has the effect of rendering the lower layers, e.g., those containing data entry fields and the submit button, inaccessible to the user.

The Brown patent describes a method of creating a composite desktop built by a user from Web content retrieved from one or more Web sites. The Barlow patent describes a system for preventing unauthorized modification of interactive objects having one or more object states by an object designer. The Humes patent describes a system and method for filtering data received by a computer system. The Official Action correctly states that "Brown further fails to disclose associating the executable script with a predetermined z-index number for a web page and rendering inaccessible those data entry elements associated with the web page that have a z-index number lower than the predetermined z-index number." The secondary patent to Barlow also fails to teach or suggest this feature of Applicant's independent claim 1, 5, 10 and 15 combinations (among other things) as evidenced by the Office Action's newly relied upon tertiary patent to Humes. However, Applicant respectfully disagrees that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to have combined the teachings of Brown with the teachings of Barlow and Humes in any manner which would have motivated one of ordinary skill in the art to have arrived at Applicant's claimed combinations for at least the reasons stated below.

Initially, Applicant respectfully submits that even assuming (strictly arguendo) that there was some motivation to combine Brown with Barlow and Humes, the resulting combination would not have enabled one of ordinary skill in the art to have arrived at Applicant's claim 1 combination. The cited sections of Humes (Figure 5; col. 2, lines 36-49), used in the Official Action to allegedly remedy the deficiency of Brown and Barlow, describe a method of filtering a page based on weighted values of the words found on the page to be accessed. For example, part of the associated text description of Figure 5 (col. 9, lines 57-63) of Humes is shown below:

"Decision block 522 determines whether the 'Score' for the page or block of text exceeds the predetermined 'Targetscore' threshold and, if so, the page or block of text is replaced with the 'FORBIDDEN' page or message in block 526 before a 'Yes' is returned by terminal block 528, indicating that access was denied based on the web page body."

This method of filtering used in Humes is not the same as “wherein said step of executing further comprises the steps of: associating said executable script with a predetermined z-index number for a web page; and rendering inaccessible those data entry elements associated with said web page that have a z-index number lower than said predetermined z-index number” which is found, among other things, in Applicant’s claim 1 combination. Additionally, two text searches were performed upon the Humes patent for the phrases “z-index” and “z-number”. Neither search of the Humes patent resulted in any hits, indicating that Humes is unconcerned with z-indices generally and the claimed use of z-index numbers, specifically. Only Applicant’s specification teaches or suggests this feature in combination with the other features of Applicant’s claim 1 combination. Similar comments apply to Applicant’s independent claim 5, 10, and 15 combinations.

Secondly, it is respectfully submitted that there would have been no motivation to combine Brown and Barlow, in the manner described, in the first place. In the Official Action it is stated that:

“It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant’s invention to have combined Brown’s method with Barlow’s method, since it would have allowed a user to restrict access to data (Barlow: column2, lines 8-10).”

It is respectfully submitted, however, that there is no basis found in either Brown or Barlow for the proposed motivation to combine because neither Brown nor Barlow suggest that there would be any desirability or need for allowing a user to restrict access to data in the system of Brown.

Similar comments apply to independent claims 5, 10 and 15, as well as dependent claims 2-4, 6-9, 11-14 and 16-17.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Brown and in further view of Barlow and in further view of Humes are respectfully requested.

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Moneymaker et al. (U.S. Patent Application Number 2002/0049708) (hereinafter "Moneymaker") and further in view of Humes (U.S. Patent Number 6,539,430). The Official Action correctly states that "Moneymaker fails to disclose associating the executable script with a predetermined z-index number for a web page and rendering inaccessible those data entry elements associated with the web page that have a z-index number lower than the predetermined z-index number." The cited sections of Humes (Figure 5, col. 2, lines 36-49), used in the Official Action to allegedly remedy the deficiency of Moneymaker, describe a method of filtering a page based on weighted values of the words found on the page to be accessed. However, as described above, with respect to claim 1, the cited sections of Humes do not remedy this deficiency since Humes makes no mention of z-index numbers, much less the use of z-index numbers set forth in Applicant's claim 18 combination.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Moneymaker and further in view of Humes are respectfully requested.

New claim 24 has been added to provide additional claim coverage for the present invention. More specifically, claim 24 describes a method for preventing data entry to a web page comprising the steps of: associating an executable script with the web page; determining if the web page uses z-index numbers; permitting a first data input to the web page; executing, in response to the first data input, the executable script; and preventing data entry to at least a portion of the web page after execution of the script, wherein the step of preventing further comprises the steps of: associating the executable script with a predetermined z-index number for the web page if the web page supports using the z-index number; associating the executable script with a division of the web page if the web page does not support using the z-index number; rendering inaccessible those data entry elements associated with the web page by rendering the division of the web page visible over the data entry elements if the web

page does not support using the z-index number; and rendering inaccessible those data entry elements associated with the web page that have a z-index number lower than the predetermined z-index number if the web page supports using the z-index number. It is respectfully submitted that the newly submitted claim is also patentably distinguishable from the documents of record.

All of the objections and rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this response or the application in general, he is invited to contact the undersigned at (540) 361-1863.

Respectfully submitted,

POTOMAC PATENT GROUP PLLC

By:



Steven M. duBois

Registration No. 35,023

Date: October 10, 2006

Potomac Patent Group, PLLC
P.O. Box 270
Fredericksburg, VA 22404
(540) 361-1863